that all these many must be that One, and it follows that the One is or has become many; but how can the limited or relative be the Absolute and how can man or beast or bird be the Divine Being? But in erecting this apparent contradiction the mind makes a double error. It is thinking in the terms of the mathematical finite unit which is sole in limitation, the one which is less than two and can become two only by division and fragmentation or by addition and multiplication; but this is an infinite Oneness, it is the essential and infinite Oneness which can contain the hundred and the thousand and the million and billion and trillion. Whatever astronomic or more than astronomic figures you heap and multiply, they cannot overpass or exceed that Oneness; for, in the language of the Upanishad, it moves not, yet is always far in front when you would pursue and seize it. It can be said of it that it would not be the infinite Oneness if it were not capable of an infinite multiplicity; but that does not mean that the One is plural or can be limited 'or described as the stim of the Many: on the contrary, it can be the infinite Many because it exceeds all limitation or description by multiplicity

and exceeds at the same time all
limitation by finite
•conceptual oneness. Pluralism is an
error because,
though there is the spiritual plurality, the
many
•souls are dependent arid
interdependent existences;
their sum also is not the One nor is it the
cosmic
totality; they depend on the One and
exist by its
Oneness: yet the plurality is not unreal, it
is the